

second tapered rollers located between said second tapered raceways;
a rib ring fitted over said seat on said pin and against said second tapered rollers to prevent said second rollers from moving up said second raceways; and
wherein said planet gear and said pin define a circumferential lubrication gap adjacent each of said first and second tapered raceways, said circumferential lubrication gap configured to permit a flow of lubricating fluid to said first and second tapered rollers.

16. (Original) A planet assembly according to claim 15 wherein said rib ring is welded to said pin.

17. (Original) A planet assembly according to claim 15 wherein said inner raceways are machined on said pin and said outer raceways are machined into said planet gear.

18. (Original) A planet assembly according to claim 15 wherein said pin comprises a core and a sleeve located around said core; wherein said inner raceways thrust rib and ring seat are on said sleeve; and wherein said core projects beyond said ends of said sleeve and forms said mounting ends of said pin.

REMARKS

Claims 4-6, 11, and 14 have been amended.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 12, and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 4-9, 11, 14-18 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 14, and 15 are in independent format.

1. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 3, 4, 7-9, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has cancelled Claims 3 and 13 with prejudice.

Applicant has amended Claims 4 and 14 to replace the term "downwardly" with the phrase "radially inward". In sectional views such as shown in Figures 1 and 3, each pair of inner and outer raceways is seen to define a raceway axis which is oblique to the axis of the planet assembly, hence the phrase "radially inward" is definite in nature, referring to a taper angle relative to the raceway axis, with "inward" meaning towards the raceway axis, and "radially" meaning "along a radial line" from the raceway axis.

As amended, Claims 4 and 14 are now believed definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

2. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

a. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, and 12

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,178,966 to *Wildhaber* is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 10, and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from amended independent Claim 14. Accordingly, Claim 11 is believed allowable over U.S. Patent No. 3,178,966 to *Wildhaber* for the same reasons as Claim 14.

b. Claims 1, 2, 3, 10-13

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,656,890 to *Marquardt* and U.S. Patent No. 4,158,972 to *Chamberlain* is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 10, and 12-13 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from amended independent Claim 14. Accordingly, Claim 11 is believed allowable over U.S. Patent No. 4,656,890 to *Marquardt* and U.S. Patent No. 4,158,972 to *Chamberlain* for the same reasons as Claim 14.

c. Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 12

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,936,655 to *Peterson* is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 10, and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 5 has been amended to depend from amended independent Claim 4. Accordingly, Claim 5 is believed allowable over U.S. Patent No. 2,936,655 to *Peterson, et al.* for the same reasons as Claim 4.

d. Claims 1, 10, and 11

The Examiner's rejections of Claims 1, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by DE Patent No. 196 11 605 A1 and U.S. Patent No. 5,368,528 to *Farrell* is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from amended independent Claim 14. Accordingly, Claim 11 is believed allowable over DE Patent No. 196 11 605 A1 and U.S. Patent No. 5,368,528 to *Farrell* for the same reasons as Claim 14.

3. Claims Objected

The Examiner has objected to Claim 6 as containing allowable subject matter, but depending from a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that Claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the independent claim. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 6 to be in independent form, including all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 from which Claim 6 originally depended. Claim 6, as amended, is believed in proper form for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 4 as containing allowable subject matter, but depending from a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the independent claim and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 4 to be in independent form, including all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2 and 3 from which Claim 4 originally depended. Claim 4, as amended, is believed in proper form for allowance.

Claim 7 as written is already in independent form. Claim 7 sets forth a method for assembling a planetary assembly as set forth in Claim 4. Claims 8 and 9 depend directly from Claim 7. Accordingly the methods of Claims 7-9 are believed allowable for the same reasons as amended Claim 4.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 14 as containing allowable subject matter, but depending from a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that Claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the independent claim and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 14 to be in independent form, including all of the limitations of independent Claim 10 and dependent Claims 12 and 13 from which Claim 14 originally depended. Claim 14, as amended, is believed in proper form for allowance.

4. Allowed Claims

Applicant acknowledged the Examiner's indication that Claims 15-18 are allowable as written.

4. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the allowance of claims 4-9, 11, 14-18 is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application on the next Office Action and feels that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the purpose of arranging such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark E. Books, Reg. No. 40,918
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200
St. Louis, Missouri 63131
Tel: (314) 238-2400
Fax: (314) 238-2401
mbooks@patpro.com